

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 17-1135

MICHAEL LADALE REEVES,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

HAMPTON FOREST APTS; BETTY PARR; MONUMENT REAL ESTATE
SVCS; JENNY DECKER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:16-cv-00715-HMH)

Submitted: May 23, 2017

Decided: May 25, 2017

Before KING, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed as modified by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Ladale Reeves, Appellant Pro Se. James Geoffrey Osborn, Jr., ROGERS,
TOWNSEND & THOMAS, Greenville, South Carolina; Stephen Lynwood Brown,
Russell Grainger Hines, YOUNG CLEMENT RIVERS, LLP, Charleston, South
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Ladale Reeves appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant Defendants summary judgment on Reeves' civil claims against Defendants, including his claims brought pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181 to 12189 (2012), and the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 to 3619 (2012), and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Reeves' state law claims. We affirm as modified.

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned of the consequences of noncompliance. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Moreover, we limit our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Reeves waived appellate review of the district court's dispositive holdings by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation after receiving proper notice, and by failing to challenge the district court's dispositive rationale in his informal brief.

Accordingly, although we affirm the district court's judgment, we modify the judgment to reflect that Reeves' state law claims are dismissed without prejudice. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED